REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 5, 2006. Claims 1 to 5 and 11 to 24 are pending in the application, of which Claims 6 to 10 having been cancelled. Of the claims under consideration, Claims 1, 11, 16 and 21 to 24 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 22 was objected to for an informality. The typographical error having been corrected herein, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 11 to 13, 15, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,535,294 (Arledge) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,765 (Mori). Claims 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Arledge, Jr. and Mori in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,438,433 (Reifman). Claims 16 to 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,348,972 (Taniguchi) in view of Arledge Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11, 16, 21 and 22.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a printer controller for controlling printing of print data. The printer controller includes a storage unit adapted to store the print data and authentication information corresponding to the print data; an input unit adapted to enable a user to input authentication information to print the print data; a collation unit adapted to collate the authentication information input by the user with the authentication information stored in the storage unit; a display unit adapted to, after the user inputs the authentication

information, display a list of print data corresponding to the input authentication information; a selection unit adapted to enable the user to select at least one print data from the list of print data displayed by said display; a control unit adapted to control the printing of the selected print data to be performed after confirming that a print charge for printing the print data selected by the user is paid; a check unit adapted to check whether it is a specific time specified by the user; a determination unit adapted to determine, if it is the specific time specified by the user, whether each of the print data stored in the storage unit should be deleted in accordance with a specific condition; and a deletion unit adapted to delete, if there is stored print data which should be deleted, the stored print data which should be deleted.

Amended Claims 11 and 16 are directed to a method corresponding to Claim 1. Amended Claims 21 and 22 are directed to a computer program corresponding to claims 11 and 16, respectively.

In contrast, Arledge discloses that if a new order has not been processed within a predetermined time duration, the new order is automatically deleted from the system. Therefore, the retailer must always monitor the new orders, because if the retailer fails to take action on a new order before the predetermined duration expires, the order will be automatically deleted from the system.

In addition, Mori merely discloses deleting the oldest job in the job management table when the table becomes full. Since it is generally impossible to predict when the table becomes full, Mori fails to disclose deleting the job at a specific time specified by the user. Moreover, Mori shows a monitoring process in Fig. 10 of the specification where the computer judges whether any job in the management table is set to

delete enabled. That is, Mori discloses that a computer must always execute a job monitoring process in order to determine which job to delete.

Applicant submits that Arledge and Mori, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 1. Specifically, the printer controller of Claim 1 displays a list of print data corresponding to authentication information input by a user, and controls printing of the print data selected from the displayed list. Thus, it is possible to prevent the print data of a certain user from being erroneously printed according to an instruction from another user.

Furthermore, the user can confirm, through the displayed list, what kind of data is stored as the print data corresponding to the relevant user oneself in a storage unit of the printer controller. Furthermore, the printer controller of Claim 1 determines whether each of the print data stored in the storage unit should be deleted in accordance with a specific condition, and, if there is print data which should be deleted, deletes the relevant print data. Thus, it is possible to prevent the print data from being stored unnecessarily in the storage unit.

In addition, the printer controller of Claim 1 checks whether it is a specific time specified by the user, and, if it is, determines whether each of the print data stored in the storage unit should be deleted in accordance with a specific condition. Thus, it is possible to prevent repeatedly determining whether each of the print data stored in the storage unit should be deleted in accordance with a specific condition. For example, if a time zone that the printer controller is not so used is designated as the specific time, it is possible to execute the determination in such a time zone. In contrast, while Mori discloses that there is a deletion time set for each print data, the print data is surely deleted

when there is an appropriate deletion time. On the other hand, in the controller of Claim 1, even if there is the specific time, the print data is not deleted according to the determination result by the determination unit. That is, the deletion time in Mori is not analogous to the specific time as featured in Claim 1.

Finally, the remaining references have been reviewed and are not seen to cure the deficiencies of Arledge and Mori.

In light of the deficiencies of the applied references as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 1, 11, 16, 21 and 22 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Claims 23 and 24

Claim 23 is directed to a printer controller for controlling printing of print data. The printer controller comprises a storage unit adapted to store the print data and authentication information corresponding to the print data; an input unit adapted to enable a user to input authentication information to print the print data; a collation unit adapted to collate the authentication information input by the user with the authentication information stored in said storage unit; a display unit adapted to, after the user inputs the authentication information, display a list of print data corresponding to the input authentication information; a selection unit adapted to enable the user to select at least one print data form the list of print data displayed by said display unit; a control unit adapted to control the printing of the selected print data to be performed; a check unit adapted to check whether it is a specific time specified by the user; a determination unit adapted to determine, if it is the specific time specified by the user, whether each of the print data stored in said storage

unit should be deleted in accordance with a specific condition; and a deletion unit adapted to delete, if there is stored print data which should be deleted, the stored print data which should be deleted.

Claim 24 is directed to a method substantially in accordance with the controller of Claim 23.

As discussed above in regard to Claim 1, Applicant submits that Arledge and Mori, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of a check unit adapted to check whether it is a specific time specified by the user, a determination unit adapted to determine, if it is the specific time specified by the user, whether each of the print data stored in said storage unit should be deleted in accordance with a specific condition, and a deletion unit adapted to delete, if there is stored print data which should be deleted, the stored print data which should be deleted as featured in Claim 23.

In light of the deficiencies of Arledge and Mori as discussed above, Applicant submits that new independent Claims 23 and 24 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the allowability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 125957v1